

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The rejections presented in the Office Action dated October 12, 2007 (hereinafter Office Action) have been considered. Claims 1-4, 6-9, 11-20, 24-26 and 29-46 remain pending in the application. Reconsideration of the pending claims and allowance of the application in view of the present response is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-4, 7-9, 12, 13, 15, 16, 18-20, 25, 26, 31-34, 39, 40, 43 and 46 are rejected based on 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 7,080,138 to Baker et al. (hereinafter "Baker"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection and submit that the claims as previously presented are not anticipated by Baker. However, in order to facilitate prosecution of the application and in a bona fide attempt to advance the application to allowance, the Applicants present this response with amendment to clarify particular aspects of the claimed invention. These amendments make more clear what is believed to have been originally set forth in these claims, but now states so more specifically.

Particular claims have been amended to indicate that the plurality of service components comprise markup-language-based web service components. Further, a markup-language-based web services registry determines service parameters that describe application interfaces of the plurality of service components. The amendments are fully supported in the Specification as filed (e.g., Specification, p. 3, lines 1-3 and p. 18, lines 13-15). Applicants respectfully submit that Baker is silent on any use of markup-language-based web service components or a markup-language-based web services registry, and therefore fails to anticipate independent Claims 1, 12, 19, and 39.

In contrast to Applicants' claims, Baker is directed to "methods and systems for selecting a best server from a group of servers that can provide similar content to a client." (col. 4, lines 39-41)(emphasis added). The servers of Baker are mirror sites that all host some identical set of content. (Baker, col. 1, lines 14-20 and col. 5, lines 27-30). Baker describes selecting, via a DNS server, a mirror site based on "a route that has the best available combination of latency, bandwidth and reliability." (col. 1, lines 21-25). Baker is describing the selecting of an IP address of a mirror site by a DNS server, and as is well known in the art, a DNS server is neither a markup-language-based web service nor a

markup-language-based web services registry. Therefore Baker fails to anticipate independent Claims 1, 12, 19, and 39 at least for failing to expressly or inherently describe markup-language-based web service components or a markup-language-based web services registry.

Dependent Claims 2-4 and 7-9 depend from independent Claim 1; dependent Claims 13, 15, 16, and 18 depend from independent Claim 12; dependent Claims 20, 25, 26, 31-34, depend from independent Claim 19; and dependent Claims 40, 43, and 46 depend from independent Claim 39. These dependent claims also stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Baker. While Applicant does not acquiesce with the particular rejections to these dependent claims, including any assertions concerning inherency or the taking of Official Notice, these rejections are now moot in view of the remarks made in connection with independent Claims 1, 12, 19, and 39. These dependent claims include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims, and recite additional features which further distinguish these claims from Baker. Therefore, dependent Claims 2-4, 7-9, 13, 15, 16, 18, 20, 25, 26, 31-34, 40, 43, and 46 are also allowable over Baker.

Claims 6, 11, 14, 17, 24, 29, 30, 35-38, 41, 42, 44 and 45 are rejected based on 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Baker in view of U.S. Publication No. 2002/0040390 by Sullivan et al. (hereinafter "Sullivan"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections. Although Applicants submit that Claims 6, 11, 14, 17, 24, 29, 30, 41, 42, 44 and 45 as previously presented are non-obvious over the combination of Baker and Sullivan, these rejections are now moot in light of the amendments to independent Claims 1, 12, 19, and 39.

Claims 6, 11, 14, 17, 24, 29, 30, 41, 42, 44 and 45 depend respectively from independent Claims 1, 12, 19, and 39. The rejections of Claims 6, 11, 14, 17, 24, 29, 30, 41, 42, 44 and 45 do not rely on Sullivan cure the deficiencies of Baker as it pertains to independent Claims 1, 12, 19, and 39, nor does Sullivan provide such a remedy. A combination of Baker and Sullivan fails to teach or suggest the invention set forth in Claims 1, 12, 19, and 39, as there is no reference to at least markup-language-based web service components. Nor does such a combination teach or suggest a markup language based web

services registry that facilitates determining service parameters that describe application interfaces. While other requisites of establishing prima facie obviousness may also be absent, the Applicants respectfully submit that the cited combination of references at least fails to teach or suggest all of the claim limitations. For at least this reason, Claims 6, 11, 14, 17, 24, 29, 30, 41, 42, 44 and 45 are not rendered obvious by the combination of Baker and Sullivan, and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully solicited.

Claim 35 has also been amended to describe markup-language-based web service components, and a markup-language-based web services registry that determines service parameters that describe application interfaces of the plurality of service components. Therefore Claim 35 is allowable over the combination of Baker and Sullivan for the same reasons given above. Claims 36-38 depend from Claim 35, and therefore are also allowable. "If an independent claim is nonobvious under 35 U.S.C. §103, then any claim depending therefrom is nonobvious." M.P.E.P. §2143.03; citing *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

Authorization is given to charge Deposit Account No. 50-3581 (NOKM.018PA) any necessary fees for this filing. If the Examiner believes it necessary or helpful, the undersigned attorney of record invites the Examiner to contact the undersigned attorney to discuss any issues related to this case.

Respectfully submitted,

HOLLINGSWORTH & FUNK, LLC
8009 34th Avenue South, Suite 125
Minneapolis, MN 55425
952.854.2700

Date: October 26, 2007

By:



William B. Ashley
Reg. No. 51,419